

Koch, Kristine

From: Jeremy Buck <jeremy_buck@fws.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 2014 12:31 PM
To: Koch, Kristine
Cc: Robert.Neely@noaa.gov
Subject: RE: Arkema Dispute Decision

Kristine-

Thanks for the call on the decision. How much influence can EPA (or other groups) have over the proposed sampling plan prepared by Arkema at this point, or is the issue too far down the line? Is there time to adjust the plan to ensure that EPA's Systematic Planning process is followed (which could involve FWS, NOAA, and the Tribes if they have not participated to this point) and to make sure the EPA's Data Quality Objective process is adhered to, along with a solid Data Quality Assessment? For this type of sampling to be meaningful, the objectives should be clearly spelled out and discussed, and non-biased sampling should occur (I know EPA has been very inclusive on this site with other groups, but time constraints and other issues has limited FWS participation so I am unfamiliar with the current plan). We already have plenty of "extra" data collected on many sites where objectives were applied liberally after the fact, and the project stalled as a result as the uncertainty was too high for anyone to make good decisions. This is one of our most important (and frustrating) sites on the river. A good, unbiased, non-judgmental sampling plan following EPA's Systematic Planning process could actually be fruitful. Thanks-Jeremy

From: Koch, Kristine [mailto:Koch.Kristine@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 2014 10:03 AM
To: Alex Liverman (liverman.alex@deg.state.or.us); Allen, Elizabeth; Audie Huber (audiehuber@ctuir.com); Blischke, Eric; Brian Cunningham (cunninghame@gorge.net); callie@ridolfi.com; Coffey, Scott; Conley, Alanna; Erin Madden (erin.madden@gmail.com); Fuentes, Rene; Gabriel Moses (